

1
2
3
4
5
6
7 TAJAI CALIP,
TAJAI CALIP,
Plaintiff,
Plaintiff,
8 v.
9 OAKLAND UNIFIED SCHOOL
OAKLAND UNIFIED SCHOOL
DISTRICT, et al.,
DISTRICT, et al.,
10 Defendants.
11

12 Case No. 15-cv-00877-SI

13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28 **ORDER RE DEADLINE TO FILE
AMENDED COMPLAINT TO AVOID
DISMISSAL WITHOUT PREJUDICE
FOR FAILURE TO PROSECUTE**

Re: Dkt. 10

Plaintiff filed this case on February 26, 2015. In an order filed March 3, 2015, Magistrate Judge Westmore denied without prejudice plaintiff's application for leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* ("IFP") because plaintiff had not fully answered question numbers 1 and 7 (last date of employment and current bank account balance). The Court's March 3, 2015 order directed plaintiff to file another IFP application with complete information.

The same order also dismissed the complaint, noting that although plaintiff alleged that she had been terminated on the basis of her gender, the complaint did not provide any details of the events that led to her termination. The Court also noted that plaintiff's termination occurred on January 20, 2010, which was more than four years prior to the filing of this action, and is, therefore, likely barred by the statute of limitations. Finally, the Court noted that plaintiff did not allege that she exhausted her administrative remedies prior to filing this lawsuit. The Court dismissed the complaint and granted plaintiff leave to file an amended complaint by March 31, 2015.

On March 9, 2015, plaintiff filed a document declining to proceed before a Magistrate Judge, and consequently this case was reassigned to the undersigned judge. On March 17, 2015, plaintiff filed a second IFP application, but that application still did not contain a complete answer

1 to question number 1. Plaintiff did not file an amended complaint.

2 Several pieces of mail addressed to plaintiff at "P.O. Box 892, Oakland, CA 94605," have
3 been returned to the court as undeliverable. Dkt. 11, 12. Plaintiff's complaint listed her address as
4 "P.O. Box \$892, Oakland, CA 94605." Dkt. 1. It is unclear to the Court whether the correct
5 address is P.O. Box 892 or perhaps P.O. Box 4892. It is also unclear whether plaintiff intends to
6 prosecute this case as plaintiff has not filed an amended complaint.

7 Accordingly, the Court orders as follows. If plaintiff wishes to prosecute this case, she
8 shall file an amended complaint and a complete IFP application (or pay the filing fee) no
9 later than April 17, 2015. If plaintiff fails to do so, the Court will dismiss this case without
10 prejudice for failure to prosecute pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(b).

11 The second IFP application, which is incomplete, is DENIED without prejudice. Dkt. 10.

12 The Clerk shall mail copies of this order and the March 3, 2015 order to plaintiff at both
13 possible addresses:

14 P.O. Box 892, Oakland, CA 94605

15 P.O. Box 4892 Oakland, CA 94605

16 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

17 Dated: April 2, 2015



18
19 SUSAN ILLSTON
20 United States District Judge
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28